

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed February 4, 2009, has been received and its contents carefully noted. The active claims, claims 1, 3-5, 7-9, 11, 14-16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 24 and 25, were rejected. By this Response, claims 1 and 11 have been amended. Support may be found in the specification and the claims as originally filed. No statutory new matter has been added. Therefore, reconsideration and entry of the claims, as amended, are respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

The Examiner rejected the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over three asserted combinations of Dible (U.S. 6,411,490), Nakano (U.S. Pub. 20030056901), Zhao (U.S. 5,643,364), and Reyzelman (U.S. 6,703,080). Applicants respectfully urge that the claims, as amended, are unobvious and that each rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) should properly be withdrawn.

Amended claims 1 and 11 emphasize the following features:

- (1) The frequency of the first high-frequency electric power is higher than the frequency of the second high-frequency electric power.
- (2) The first matching unit is located just under the first electrode (matching unit 80 and electrode 12 in Applicants' preferred examples).
- (3) The second matching unit (exemplary unit 84) is located under the first matching unit (80).
- (4) The transmission line is formed by a coaxial tube (exemplary tube 88) that is different from a cable.
- (5) The first matching unit (80) and the first electrode (12) are connected only by a power supply rod (exemplary rod 34).
- (6) The second matching unit (84) and the first electrode (12) are connected via another coaxial tube (exemplary tube 102) that is different from a cable.

Because of the combination of above features (1) to (6), the "space", containing the HF equipment (exemplary part 32), is defined very simply by the tubular supporting part and the

bottom surface of the first electrode. This is a very advantageous arrangement beyond what could be expected from conventional structure.

None of the cited disclosures teaches or suggests Applicants' combination of features (1) to (6), especially features (1) to (3) to so define a space housing HF equipment such as Applicants' preferred HF part 32. Dible is completely silent about the arrangement or layout of matching units (214 and 216). Nakano, Zhao and Reyzelman are silent even about the application of double RF. For at least these reasons, amended claims 1 and 11 should be allowed over the asserted combinations. The rejections are overcome.

Request for Interview

Applicants respectfully request either a telephonic or an in-person interview should there be any remaining issues.

CONCLUSION

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

It is not believed that extensions of time are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in accompanying documents. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to prevent abandonment of this application, then such extensions of time are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a), and any fees required therefor are hereby authorized to be charged to **Deposit Account No. 02-4300, Attorney Docket No. 033082 M 194.**

Respectfully submitted,
SMITH, GAMBRELL & RUSSELL, LLP



Michael A. Makuch
Reg. No. 32,263

Date: July 29, 2009
1130 Connecticut Ave., NW, #1130
Washington, D.C. 20036
Telephone: (202) 263-4300
Facsimile: (202) 263-4329